

Response to Office Action Dated March 18, 2004  
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/932,213  
Page 17 of 19

## REMARKS

### Summary of the Office Action

1. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 14, 19-22, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Granberg (US2003/0112225A1).
2. Claims 2, 5, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Granberg.
3. Claims 8-13, 15-18, 24-26 and 30-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granberg in view of Gray (U.S. Patent No. 5,440,629).

### Summary of the Response

Claims 1-44 are pending.

The TITLE has been amended.

The ABSTRACT has been replaced.

### Detailed Remarks

Applicant requests consideration of the following remarks.

1. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 14, 19-22, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Granberg (US2003/0112225A1).

With regard to independent Claims 1, and 19, a limitation has been added that recites "wherein an overall length of the mobile device is reduced when the second segment is moved towards the contracted position." It is Applicant's position that *Granberg* does not teach a mobile device in which the moving segments serve to reduce an overall length of the device. While *Granberg* does teach an input mechanism that can be moved over a display, this movement does not reduce the length of the mobile device (note for example FIGS. 1, 2 and 3 in *Granberg*).

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 14 depend from Claim 1. Claims 21 and 22 depend from Claim 19. For reasons stated above, it is submitted that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Response to Office Action Dated March 18, 2004  
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/932,213  
Page 18 of 19

With regard to independent Claim 27, an added limitation is “wherein an overall length of the housing assembly is reduced when the second housing segment is moved from the extended position towards the contracted position.” As explained above, *Granberg* does not employ moving segments that affect length of the overall device. For all of the reasons stated above, Applicant believes independent Claim 27 and dependent Claims 28 and 29 are in condition for allowance.

2. Claims 2, 5, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Granberg.

Applicant submits that this rejection is now moot, as the independent Claims 1 and 19 from which these claims depend now recites language that states the first and second segments are moveable relative to one another to affect an overall length of the mobile device. As explained in the previous section, *Granberg* does not teach a mobile device where housing segments are moveable to affect a length of the device.

C. Claims 8-13, 15-18, 24-26 and 30-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granberg in view of Gray (U.S. Patent No. 5,440,629).

Applicant submits that this rejection is now moot because the independent claims from which these claims depend from all recite language to the effect that the first and second segments are slideably coupled to one another (as recited in Claim 19), or alternatively moveable coupled “to move primarily along one axis” relative to one another (as recited in Claim 1). While *Gray* may have a teaching of a mobile device in which the moving segments reduce an overall length of the device, the segments in *Gray* are not moveable in primarily one direction. Rather, *Gray* teaches pivoting housing segments.

With regard to independent Claim 41, *Gray* does not teach or disclose a sliding motion between housing segments to affect a size of the mobile device.

For reasons stated above, Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Response to Office Action Dated March 18, 2004  
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/932,213  
Page 19 of 19

### CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any questions or comments that the Examiner wishes to direct to Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at (408) 551-6632. The Patent Office is authorized to charge all unpaid fees to the deposit account 50-1914.

Submitted by,



Van Mahamedi

Reg. No. 42,828

Correspondence Address:

Van Mahamedi

SHEMWELL GREGORY & COURTNEY

4880 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 201

San Jose, CA 95129

### Certificate of Mailing/Transmission

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper is being submitted by facsimile transmission to the U.S. Patent Office using fax number 17038729306; or submitted with the U.S. Postal service with sufficient postage as first class mail, addressed to "Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on June 17, 2004.

Signature:



Print Name: Van Mahamedi